

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Task Team (TT)

Minutes of Meeting
February 4, 2005, 7th meeting

Participants: Peter Steinert, Chair (HQ Mass Transportation), Ina Gerhard, Recorder (HQ Mass Transportation), Xiomara Balladares (HQ Right of Way), Don Dean (HQ Research and Innovation), Tom Dumas (Caltrans District 10), Jean Finney (Caltrans District 4), Julie Kirschbaum (San Francisco County Transportation Authority), Bob James (Caltrans, District 11), Charles Lau (Caltrans District 8), Eunice Lovi (San Joaquin Regional Transit District), Peter Strauss (San Francisco MUNI), Mike Valcho and Linda Wright (Caltrans District 7)

Introductions/Approval of January 7 Minutes

Following the introductions, the TT approved the last meeting minutes without comments/changes.

Report on State DOT Survey

Ina Gerhard summarized what Connecticut, New York and Florida State DOTs are doing to facilitate BRT. The level and type of involvement of state DOTs in transit and in BRT development are very different from state to state. None of the states surveyed, however, has statewide guidelines addressing BRT in place. BRT is being developed as part of transit enhancement strategies in heavily traveled corridors. A written summary of the survey will be sent out to the TT members.

A lot of the information on state DOTs and BRT came from Sam Zimmerman. Peter Steinert has requested management approval to invite Sam to one of the next meetings to provide his expertise in scoping and directing the work of the TT and the subcommittees. Management has not yet responded to the request.

Draft Scoping Document Review

Parts of the draft scoping document were discussed, in particular, the two sections on page 2 of the document: "Common features ..." and "Advanced features...". Several suggestions were made on how to revise and enhance those sections of the document, such as to use full sentences instead of just bullet points; single out important exceptions (f.e. mention LA peak hour dedicated lanes); separate out and distinguish the incremental improvements from top to bottom; distinguish operational vs. infrastructure features; explain relevance of understanding certain features, f.e. the impact on low-floor buses on stop and station design. Also, a section listing all CA BRT projects should be added to the document.

All the suggestions were noted and will, if appropriate, be incorporated into the final document, which will be presented to management and the TT by the end of February.

Peter shared Gale Ogawa's (Acting Chief, Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation) e-mail with the group, in which she states that DMT does not have much more money to support the TT (the site visits were already paid for) and that she would like to see a report on the status of the TT and draft guidelines by the end of February (as stated in the initial timeline).

Ina informed the group about the BRT link on Division of Mass Transportation's website with links to the CA BRT project fact sheets, other presentations, and Task Team products and documents. The link can be found at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/ostp.htm#brt>

Any feedback and suggestions for improvement are appreciated. The website is supposed to be developed into a resource for BRT in CA. Please submit any BRT related information or links to be posted on this website to: Ina_Gerhard@dot.ca.gov.

Subcommittee Formation

Peter Steinert referred to Chris Schmidt's idea of establishing a **technical and a planning/coordination subcommittee** as opposed to the initial idea of splitting up into **freeway and conventional highway subcommittees**. The group had a hard time deciding on what would be the best way to proceed.

Julie Kirschbaum proposed to follow Sam Zimmerman's course outline in establishing the subcommittees: **Technology, service planning, infrastructure, and identity**.

Julie and Jean Finney emphasized the importance of Caltrans guidelines to address service planning and identity aspects as essential components of a successful BRT service, which are closely linked to some of Caltrans responsibilities, for example identity/branding ties in with station design features.

The group agreed to form the following subcommittees:

- 1. Technical**
- 2. Infrastructure**
- 3. Service planning/identity**

The group then discussed what the substance/content of the guidelines should be. Peter suggested emulating existing examples and developing them into guidelines. It might be helpful to share some Caltrans guidelines with the group. Other suggestions were to develop an outline or Table of Contents or a draft purpose statement that would help the subcommittees narrow down which issues to address.

In response to the question of how the subcommittees should meet, it was suggested that they be established based on geography. It was felt that each region has enough expertise to deal with either one of the subject areas with one exception: Paul Chiu and other District 4 people and agencies with their expertise in TSP and cooperation should be on the technical subcommittee.

The actual establishment of subcommittees was postponed until the next meeting.

Peter will check with management to see whether travel money for subcommittee meetings will be available.

Next Steps

- Peter/Ina will send out sample guidelines for review by TT.
- Julie will come up with a list of what the subcommittees should be addressing.
- Peter/Ina will prepare report to be submitted to management by the end of February.
- Ina will schedule meeting dates and rooms for the next couple of months. (See dates at the end of the minutes).

To be addressed at the next meeting:

- Talk about sample guidelines
- Establish subcommittees
- Report back on meeting with management

Next meeting

The next videoconference is scheduled for:

Friday, March 4, 2005, 9 – 11 am

Please also note that we have scheduled March videoconferences for:

Friday, April 1, 2005, 9 - 11 am

Friday, May 6, 2005, 9 – 11 am

Friday, June 3, 2005, 9 – 11 am

Friday, July 1, 2005, 9 – 11 am

Friday, August 5, 2005, 9 – 11 am

Minutes by: Ina Gerhard